## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA SOUTHERN DIVISION

BRADLEY THOMAS, &	)
LAURIE THOMAS	)
	)
Plaintiff,	
v.	) 1:2006-CV-165-MEF-DRB
NCB MANAGEMENT SERVICES,	)
INC., & JOHN HARDING,	)
INDIVIDUALLY	)
	)
Defendants.	)

## DEFENDANTS' REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' OBJECTION TO THE MOTION TO COMPEL SITE INSPECTION

COMES NOW, NCB MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC. and JOHN HARDING, the Defendants in the above styled cause of action, by and through their undersigned counsel and file this reply to the Plaintiffs' Response to this Defendants' Response to the Motion to Compel Site Inspection. In reply to the Plaintiffs' Response, the Defendants set forth the following:

1. The Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Site Inspection pursuant to Rule 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is due to be denied on the grounds that a site inspection has no relevancy to the issues in this lawsuit, and furthermore, because the Plaintiffs' notice for site inspection is overly broad and unduly

Thomas v. NCB CV-1.06CV165.MEF-DRB

LOR File No: 06-060-JLL/DTS/jkj

Page 1 of 4

Case 1:06-cv-00165-MEF-TFM Document 48 Filed 05/08/2007 Page 2 of 4

burdensome.

2. The Plaintiffs' Complaint arises out of the Defendants' alleged

violation of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. Specifically, the Plaintiffs have

alleged that Co-Defendant Harding made abusive phone calls to the Plaintiffs.

(See Plaintiffs' Complaint).

3. The Plaintiffs seek to inspect "the physical premises of the Company

and the area of the Company where: (1) collectors work or are working, (2) it

maintains executive offices, (3) computer operations are centralized or networked

from, (4) telephone systems are centralized, (5) collection systems are used, and

(6) all areas where John Harding has worked or is working at the Company." (See

Plaintiffs' Notice of Site Inspection).

4. The Plaintiffs' state that the "necessity and purpose" of the site

inspection is "to learn the specific layout of the collection center, the location of

various managers and supervisors in relation to collection employees, who set

near the Defendant, who was working at the time of the alleged abusive calls to

the Plaintiffs, as well as for numerous other legitimate litigation purposes." The

Plaintiffs further state that they "desire to learn precisely how this collector

operates and how it records its collection communication activities with persons

such as the Plaintiffs." (See Plaintiffs' Response to Defendants' Response to

Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Site Inspection).

Thomas v. NCB CV-1.06CV165 MEF-DRB

LOR File No: 06-060-JLL/DTS/jkj

Page 2 of 4

5. The Plaintiffs go on to state that "the Rule 34 inspection is aimed at determining the precise physical location of the Defendant debt collectors in relation to one another, identifying other potential witnesses to these telephone calls, and identifying the specific nature of the telephone and computer systems used to record these collection calls." (See Plaintiffs' Response to Defendants' Response to Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Site Inspection).

All information that the Plaintiffs claim to seek through the site 6. inspection could be discovered through deposition. Additionally, a site inspection is not going to provide the Plaintiffs with any insight into the conduct of Co-Defendant Harding during the time period that is at issue in this suit. The site inspection is not necessary and would allow for an unwarranted interruption of Co-Defendant NCB's business operations.

WHEREFORE, the foregoing premises considered, these Defendants respectfully request that this Honorable Court deny the Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Site Inspection.

Respectfully submitted

JEFFREY 1. LUTHER (LUTHJ0532)

D. TRICE STABLER (STABD3501)

Attorneys for NCB Management Services, Inc.

and John Harding

## OF COUNSEL:

LUTHER, OLDENBURG & RAINEY, P.C. Post Office Box 1003

Mobile, Alabama 36633

PH:

(251) 433-8088

FX:

(251) 433-8011

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have this day of May 2007, served a copy of the foregoing pleading was electronically filed with the Clerk of this Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

David G. Poston, Esquire Brock and Stout P. O. Drawer 311167 Enterprise, AL 36331-1167 (334) 671-5555 (334) 671-2689 (Fax)

Gerald A. Templeton, Esq. The Templeton Group, P.C. 1000 Providence Park, Suite 200 Birmingham, AL 35244 (205) 980-8828 (205) 980-8848

OF COUNSEL